REMARKS

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Birdwell et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The claims have been amended to more clearly describe that plug-in data (which includes a delivery confirmation ID, client information for uniquely specifying the client machine and server information for uniquely specifying the server machine) is requested and transmitted separately from, and after content has been received by the client machine. Delivery confirmation data is transmitted to the server machine only after information in the plug-in data has been processed by the client machine.

In the system of Birdwell et al. content itself carries a download identification. The receiving client reads the download identification contained in the content and confirms receipt of the content by sending a "confirm download" message to the server (see col. 6, lines 34-49). In the present invention, a confirmation of receipt of content by the client machine is not relayed to the server machine at the time of the receipt of the content itself. Rather, after the receipt of content, a request for plug-in data (which is not contained in the content) is made, and a confirmation of receipt of the content is made only after the plug-in data has been separately received by the client machine.

Moreover, the "delivery confirmation ID" in present invention is issued every time contents are requested by the client machine, so that it identifies respective delivery of content. Accordingly, even if the same content is requested by two separate client machines, the "delivery confirmation ID" issued for delivery of the contents to one client machine is

9

different from the "delivery confirmation ID" issued for the other client machine of the other.

Further, even if the same content is requested by the same client machine twice, the "delivery confirmation ID" issued for the first delivery of the content is different from that of the second delivery of the contents.

In contrast, in Birdwell et al., the "download identification" is issued for "broadcast," so that it identifies the entire "broadcast" (see column 6, lines 34-35). Accordingly, if the same content is requested by two client machines, the common "download identification" issued for the entire "broadcast" is issued for both client machines (see column 6, lines 34-38). Further, if the same download data once transferred is transferred again, the same "download identification" used in connection to the first transfer is again used for the second transfer (see column 7, lines 12-16).

Also, the "delivery confirmation ID" in the present invention is sent from the server machine to a client machine within the "plug-in data" and then sent back from the client machine to the server within the "delivery confirmation data", so that the server can confirm that the client machine had received the "plug-in data" and its corresponding "contents."

In Birdwell et al., the "download identification" is used to confirm receipt of its corresponding download data by the client, but the "download identification" is not sent back to the server with the "confirm download massage" (column 6, lines 43-45). Thus, the server cannot use the "download identification" to confirm that the download data is received by the

respective client, because the "download identification" does not identify its receiving client.

For these reasons, amended claims 1-10 are allowable over Birdwell et al.

Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. The Examiner should contact Applicants' undersigned attorney if a telephone conference would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By

B. Joe Kim
Registration No. 41,895

June 28, 2004

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978